

August 27

WHEN RULES BAR EMPLOYMENT

As for those youngsters who are willing to work, many are finding out that unions bar them from getting a job.

This experience of a west coast teenager illustrates the problem: "I applied for a job the other day at a warehouse, only to find that you have to belong to the Teamsters Union. No union card, no work. It's a lot of redtape to get a card; you have to know someone who knows someone."

Says a New York job placement official: "Trade union restrictions are a definite bar. Some craft unions confine their apprentice openings to sons, relatives or close friends of members."

A number of businessmen report that "teenagers don't have a chance" when contracts contain union clauses—requiring all hiring to be done through union channels. Others blame unions for pricing young workers out of jobs.

An example of the latter is cited by a Los Angeles businessman: "The meatcutter apprenticeship requires 2 years—at a starting pay of \$90 to \$100 a week. This is big pay for a boy who doesn't know very much. Employers are forced to hire experienced workers because they can get more output per dollar out of them."

LAWS VERSUS EMPLOYMENT

Work rules set by law—at Federal, State, and local levels—are cited as another obstacle.

Youths under 18 are prohibited from using power tools in most places. Night work is strictly regulated. So are jobs considered to be hazardous—such as working in excavations.

Says an official in the U.S. Employment Service, "These rules keep kids out of jobs. For many school dropouts, all they can do is dig ditches. Laws should be reviewed."

From the head of a Macon, Ga., hardware and farm-equipment-supply firm:

"Before the restrictive Federal laws on child labor, and before the wage-hour law, we had at all times a group of young men who were learning the business. Many were high school boys who worked Saturdays and in summer; others were school dropouts or newly graduated.

"All were paid on the basis of what they were worth, which usually ran 50 percent of regular wages. Now we cannot do this." The head of this firm goes on to say that there is a "great shortage of trained men in the hardware field at all levels."

An so go the reports—throwing new light on the teenage job problem.

Many jobless youths, it turns out, could find work if they were not so choosy about the type of job or the pay. Many others, who really want to work, are bumping into bars set by unions or by labor laws.

That's what the experts say is behind the seeming paradox of heavy unemployment with jobs going begging.

The Test Ban Treaty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ALBERT W. WATSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 27, 1963

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, in the current test ban debate on Capitol Hill and in the various news media, too much attention has been given to the so-called political considerations which supposedly make it mandatory that the Senate accede to ratification of the Moscow test ban treaty. It would seem, however, that the crucial factor to be considered

is how the treaty will affect our national defense posture. Because, after all, this is and has been the primary deterrent to war.

On August 24, 1963, one of the outstanding newspapers in my district, the Times and Democrat, of Orangeburg, S.C., published a column by Messrs. Robert S. Allen and Paul Scott, of the Hall Syndicate, giving the disadvantages which the Joint Chiefs of Staff say the Moscow test ban treaty would pose to our defense posture.

The article also presents the advantages which would supposedly accrue to our Military Establishment by ratification of the proposed treaty.

However, Mr. Speaker, the score, as reported by the Allen-Scott column, stands seven to four against our national security and in favor of the military might of the Soviet Union. I notice that the final point given as being favorable to the United States revolves around the fact that we have more nuclear reactors and a greater stockpile of nuclear material than the Soviet Union. There have been recent reports in the news, however, indicating that the United States is willing to close many of our nuclear reactors and to transfer some of our stockpile of nuclear material to some international agency for peaceful purposes. I might point out, Mr. Speaker, that in the recent proposal advanced at Geneva by our negotiators, we offered to make much more of the material available than the Soviet Union in an effort to induce Soviet agreement. So it seems, Mr. Speaker, that the fourth advantage may not turn out to be much of an advantage at all if we proceed with our present plans.

Under unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, I include the Allen-Scott column of August 24, 1963, in the Record:

DISADVANTAGES ARE DISTURBING

WASHINGTON, D.C.—The military disadvantages of the nuclear test ban treaty to the United States outnumber the advantages seven to four.

That's the disturbing comparison in a terse summation of a position paper of the Joint Chiefs of Staff prepared especially for the Senate committees considering the pact.

This still-unpublished analysis is the basis on which the four top military leaders reached their admittedly tepid approval of this agreement.

Already this study is the core of the struggle over Senate ratification.

It is on the key issues raised by the Joint Chiefs that treaty opponents are insistently demanding specific and unequivocal safeguards and guarantees from President Kennedy.

These demands, rather than the pact itself, have become the real battleground.

Presumably, this highly significant comparison will eventually be made known to the American people. In the meanwhile, this column can authoritatively report the following publishable highlights:

ADVANTAGES TO THE UNITED STATES FROM THE LIMITED NUCLEAR TEST BAN

1. United States has a larger number of nuclear weapons.
2. United States has a wider variety of delivery systems.
3. United States leads in low yield (tactical) weapons technology. However, the United States has virtually no information on the extent of Russian underground testing of such armaments.
4. United States has more nuclear plants and a greater stockpile of nuclear material.

DISADVANTAGES

1. The Soviet has a definite superiority in "high yield (5 to 100 megaton)" weapons.
2. Soviet knows more about the effects of "high yield" weapons.
3. Soviet is further advanced in "high yield" weapons technology.
4. Soviet is considerably ahead of United States in antiballistic missiles.
5. The treaty would enable the Soviet to attain parity with the United States in tactical nuclear weapons.
6. There are strong reasons to believe the Soviet knows more about radar blackout effects that are crucial to the development of antimissile missiles.
7. The treaty bars the testing of nuclear weapons to determine their performance under operational conditions. This is a particularly critical handicap to the United States.

There is a striking similarity between the unpublished position paper of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the main points made by Dr. Edward Teller, "father" of the H-bomb, in his opposition testimony before the Senate Preparedness Subcommittee.

Like the military leaders, the noted scientist stressed that the disadvantages of the pact outnumber the advantages to the United States.

Also like them, he asserted that: Russia is definitely ahead of the United States in the development of antimissile missiles; has a big lead in "high yield" nuclear weapons and technology.

Other important points made by Teller which have not yet been disclosed are:

Tests of low yield (several kilotons) so-called clean nuclear weapons cannot be readily detected.

Little is known about Soviet methods of producing clean nuclear weapons.

Similarly, the United States has little information about Russian underground testing.

Small underground tests cost around \$500,000 each. A 10-kiloton (equivalent of 10,000 tons of TNT) test costs around \$1 million.

A 100-megaton (equivalent to 100 million tons of TNT) nuclear explosive can weigh as little as 10,000 pounds (5 tons).

Scientists at Kirtland Air Force Base, N. Mex., are working on a "capacitor"—a device that would be used to simulate atmospheric nuclear tests. This extraordinary project is highly experimental and its chances of success very conjectural. However, the scientists expect to gain much valuable information in the process of building the capacitor * * *. The Russian air force is now making daily flights between Cairo and the capital of Yemen. The planes have Egyptian markings, but belong to Russia and are operated by Russian crews. The Soviet also has set up a military academy in Yemen to train officers and noncoms * * *. According to a Peking broadcast, Robert Friend, described as a "professor from the United States," is visiting Red China as guest of the Chinese Peoples Association for Cultural Relations with Foreign Countries. He was met at the railroad depot by a number of Communist officials and given red-carpet treatment.

Castro Ended Freedom in Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 27, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, apologists for Communists Castro would like us to

slans actually will improve if the proposed test ban treaty is approved.

If this is true, the Russians have deceived themselves—something of a reversal in view of the fact that they normally confine themselves to deceiving the West..

Since these witnesses are willing to accept Russia's signature on a crucial document, perhaps they also will be willing to accept as sincere the Russian belief, just expressed to Peiping, that the test treaty represents a gain for communism because it will help liquidate nuclear advantages once held by the United States.

Teenage Unemployment Linked to Choosiness, Union Regulations, and Labor Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 27, 1963

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, a recent special report in the August 19, 1963, edition of U.S. News & World Report suggests three reasons for the paradoxical situation that now exists in regard to our teenage unemployment problem. While Government labor statistics indicate extensive unemployment among teenagers, there are still many thousands of jobs appropriate for teenagers that cannot be filled.

First, the report contends that many jobless youths could find work if they were not so choosy about the type of employment they will accept. Despite the high rate of teenage joblessness, openings for unskilled workers are going begging. The article says that teenagers are particularly wary of time-consuming and menial positions, and that they are interested only in jobs with high pay, convenience, and considerable status value.

Second, the article points out that even if a youngster is willing and able to work, union regulations often bar him from getting a job.

Third, labor laws of Federal, State, and local governments often make it difficult for teenagers to fill jobs that are available.

Mr. Speaker, these three obstacles to teenage employment explain a great deal about the paradox of high unemployment among teenagers alongside many unfilled jobs. Because of the importance of this issue to our domestic economic debate under unanimous consent I include this article from the U.S. News & World Report in the Record:

SPECIAL REPORT: YOUNG PEOPLE WITHOUT JOBS—HOW REAL IS THE PROBLEM?

(NOTE.—Hordes of idle teenagers unable to find work. Such is the situation portrayed by official statistics. Dig into the trouble, however, and you get a different picture. Many jobs are available. Idleness often is preferred to work considered menial. Unions bar many young workers. So do child labor laws. Here is the story—in actual cases.)

Reported from New York, Washington, Detroit, and San Francisco.

Nearly a million teenagers—about one out

of six of those in the Nation's labor force—are looking for work and unable to find it.

That's one out of seven white teenagers; one out of three Negroes.

Yet jobs for the unskilled are going unclaimed from one end of the country to the other. Restaurants and hotels complain of chronic shortages of help. Farmers do, too, in harvest season. Homeowners constantly are forced to do jobs that they would like to hire someone to do. Streets of almost every city are a mess.

Talk to Government officials handling employment problems, to employment agencies, job counselors, businessmen, and others and you quickly find a wide range of explanations for what appears to be a paradox.

In some cases, union rules prevent teenagers from getting jobs. In others, Federal, State, and local laws against child labor are a factor. Minimum wage laws put pressure on employers to hold down on use of unskilled labor. Laws in many communities bar youths from working in excavations or from using power tools—including power lawn mowers.

Parents are singled out for blame by many in the employment field. Says an official of a New York agency:

"Today there is no such thing as telling a youth to get a job this week or else. Instead, parents often tell their children there is no rush to get a job—especially during hot weather. During a hot spell our traffic falls off 75 percent.

"Many teenagers would prefer to 'bum off the old man' rather than take jobs that are considered menial or that require hard physical work."

Another in the job-placement field said: "Today's teenagers are functional illiterates. Even those who complete school lack real training or skills."

CASE HISTORIES

Examples abound to illustrate what is going on.

Recently, several jobs opened up in Washington, D.C., for grounds keepers—cutting grass, weeding, tending bushes and shrubs. Difficulties in filling the jobs are cited by a U.S. Employment Service official:

"A half dozen youths, out of work for months, turned down the job. They told me: 'That's field work. My folks did that down South and I'm not going to do it here.' Instead, they prefer to hang around street corners."

From a job-placement official in New York: "Kitchen paper ads show the great demand for kitchen and dish-washing help. Many white and Negro youth won't take the jobs. They feel that such work is only fit for Puerto Ricans."

A company in Detroit advertised for 50 salesmen to peddle ice cream from bicycle carts. Up to now, only half the jobs have been filled.

Says an official of the Michigan employment service: "We've got commission jobs—door-to-door selling—running out of our ears. You can't find people to take them."

From the owner of a Washington, D.C., shoe repair shop: "I can't get any help. Nobody wants to be a cobbler. Kids today just want glamour jobs."

A Maryland lumber executive relates his experience in getting two workers to spread gravel in his driveway. "When I went over to pick up the workers, their mother said they weren't around. I asked why, since they had promised to do the job, and she answered: 'The relief check's just come in. Until they drink that up, you won't find them.'"

From the head of an employment agency in New York: "I recently got a job for a young girl as a file clerk at \$60 a week. After 3 days she stopped showing up for work. She told me that she had gotten bored with the job."

This example of teenage job attitudes comes from a Los Angeles job agency:

"Not long ago we got a job for a girl as a clerk-typist at \$75 a week—\$15 a week more than she was making in her previous job. She quit after 3 weeks. The reason she gave us was: 'They kept me going from 9 until 5.'"

Says a job expert in New York: "Kids today all want fun jobs—like receptionist—and often turn down jobs that require effort."

TOO FAR TO WALK

This "choosy" attitude about jobs shows up in city after city. One case is cited of the teenager in Chicago who turned down a job because the location required a six-block walk from the subway.

Jobs lacking in "status" often are rejected. A clerk-typist's job, for example, might be passed up. If that same job had the title of "administrative assistant," however, it would be snapped up—even at lower pay.

"Plenty of girls would rather not work than take a routine job," says one job authority, adding: "The trouble is that this attitude doesn't show up in the unemployment statistics that get all the headlines."

MUSIC, MAESTRO, PLEASE

Just the other day a girl walked into a New York employment agency and asked for "a creative job, one with scope." What did she have in mind? Her answer: "I'd like a job suggesting to Leonard Bernstein what music he should play."

A number of employers report difficulty in hiring office help.

"We have trouble employing young girls unless we can show them that there are other young girls on the staff," says one businessman.

In some places, office workers specify exactly where they want to work. Says an official in New York: "Young workers used to state a preference for an area—say downtown Manhattan. Now they specify the street and sometimes even the building. Just the other day we were asked to find jobs for two girls in the Pan Am Building. They weren't interested in anything else."

Employers report that many younger workers have definite ideas about how much they should be paid.

For example, take the comment of a job-placement director in New York: "If you offer some girls jobs as typists for \$65 a week, they will refuse and say that their friends are making \$80. They won't settle for \$65, even if it means no job."

Says the head of a west coast job agency: "We get dozens of jobseekers who absolutely refuse to go below a certain salary figure."

Parents often are blamed for teenagers' job attitudes.

A job counselor in San Francisco says: "Parents are overprotective. At the parents' urging, and amazing number of girls who have been working less than a year will quit their jobs to take a 3-month vacation in the summer. And these kids are from middle-class homes, not wealthy families."

Says a specialist in job problems of young workers:

"How can you expect today's youngsters to go out and dig for a job? They have been coddled and sheltered all their life."

Another source of job trouble: Insistence by parents that their children take college-preparatory work rather than business or vocational courses.

"Most parents won't let their children go to a trade school or take a commercial course," says one youth counselor. "But when their children don't make the grade and are not college material, they have no salable skills and training. Even so, these youngsters equate a high school diploma with a white-collar job that pays well. They won't take anything else."

1963

believe that whatever he is he is better than Batista, but they ignore the facts. Without making a brief for the former dictator, there is no doubt that Castro is much worse. Now the people have lost all their freedoms, their country is poverty stricken, they work under conditions akin to slavery, and they are a people without hope.

Those who would perpetuate Castro in power would like us to believe the choice is between this bandit dictator and a return to Batista. This is not true. Batista has no following in Cuba and when the Cubans rid themselves of Castro they will be able to have a government of their own choosing.

The following article written by Ken Thompson in the Dallas Morning News shows the many ways that Castro is worse than Batista:

CUBA: CASTRO WORSE THAN BATISTA

(By Ken Thompson)

Johnny-come-lately liberals who once regarded Fidel Castro as the George Washington of the Caribbean—an emancipator, an agrarian reformer—are now admitting that perhaps they were mistaken. All but the most hardened eggheads are forced to concede today that Castro is a Communist.

It took public boasting by Castro himself to the effect that he always has been and always will be a Marxist-Leninist, to bring his defenders in the United States around to the same conclusion. But in a face-saving move, most of these people still insist that Castro is wrong when he says he always has been a Red. Apparently they know him better than he knows himself. The popular line with these people is that Fidel betrayed the revolution he led; that he started out all right but went astray.

To bolster their position they remind us of the evils of Castro's predecessor, Batista. For some time, the propaganda barrage against the Batista regime—even after it was long gone from Cuba—was so extensive that Castro had to look good by comparison.

Let's take a look at what Cuba was like before Castro came to power.

For more than a decade, from 1940 to 1952, Cuba was governed by the rule of law under the constitution of 1940. Under that constitution, the Cuban people were guaranteed a freely elected, representative government. In 1952, Batista began to tear down this guarantee—but it was not until 1959, when Castro came to power, that it was finally and completely destroyed.

Even under Batista, however, there was substantial freedom of speech, religion and press. There was a recognizable degree of justice—with the right of habeas corpus guaranteed to most, if not all Cubans.

The Cuban people lived better under Batista. Before 1959 Cuba had the highest standard of living in Latin America. Its literacy rate was the third-highest. It had more miles of railroads and highways than any country of comparable size. There were more doctors per capita than all but two other Latin-American countries and more telephones than all but one other country.

Cuban currency was on a par with the dollar. Industry and trade were abundant. Social legislation was amazingly progressive. Workers were guaranteed a month paid vacation every year. They could not be dismissed from their jobs without court action. They were given 48 hours of pay for 40 hours of work, plus retirement, hospitalization and numerous other fringe benefits. Salaries in Cuba before Castro were the highest in Latin America and the fourth-highest in the world.

Return to Batista? It might look pretty good. But it isn't going to happen. Batista has few if any exile supporters. Only the

tinest fraction of the exiles would advocate his return. Cuban-exile groups have had enough of dictators, and they don't want another simply because he would be better than the one they now have.

The lingering hue and cry about the evils of Batista, the hand-wringing by those who say today that, sure, they want to get rid of Castro but fear Batista will return, is as phony as it can be. There is no danger that Cuba will be handed over to him if Castro is overthrown. The only purpose served by such talk is the delaying of that overthrow and a return to the better days before the revolution—without Batista.

The Peace Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. CHARLES L. WELTNER

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 27, 1963

Mr. WELTNER. Mr. Speaker, the first Peace Corps volunteers are completing their initial tour of duty, and are returning to the United States. We have received much information, both good and bad, concerning the effectiveness of this new cold war weapon.

Miss Dianne Bridges, a constituent of mine, was Atlanta's first Peace Corps volunteer, and has now returned from duty in Oslob, Philippines. Miss Bridges has written an excellent article for the Emory Alumnus, the Emory University alumni magazine, July 1963 issue. In this article Miss Bridges gives a vivid description of life in the tiny village of Oslob, on the island of Cebu in the Philippines. Though too long to include in its entirety, I offer for inclusion in the RECORD the last paragraphs of the article. These are of particular interest to me in judging the success of the Peace Corps to date.

The excerpt follows:

ASSIGNMENT IN OSLOB
(By Miss Dianne Bridges)

And so life in the Philippines goes on—interesting and different. I have learned a fantastic amount about the life, beliefs and customs of Filipinos. At the same time, of course, they have learned firsthand about Americans. If nothing else, they now know that Americans eat rice, they do not feed all their corn to the hogs, they wear Bermuda shorts and bathing suits to the beach, and they come in all different sizes and colors. Just from the point of understanding between nations, the Peace Corps has greatly succeeded. At long last, these people are learning that the "ugly American" need not be typical of all those from the great United States. Also we are gathering a wealth of knowledge about these people of a small group of tropical islands out in the Pacific.

Yes, there have been plenty of times when I have been lonely and homesick. Sometimes the differences cease to be interesting and educational and tend to get me down—the daily, hungry, high-pitched scream of hogs, the ever-present filth in public places, the pungent, disagreeable odors, the absolute poverty, the dirt, and all the bugs are enough to make life unpleasant if you dwell on them.

However I know now that I can erase all these disturbing things by merely watching the sky turn rosy from the sunset, feeling the gentle breeze of the majestic palm trees,

hearing the sound of the waves rolling in lazily on the white beach, or seeing absolute joy in a child's face.

One of the main lessons I've learned here is to appreciate my own country. I know when I get home, I'm going to be extremely grateful for all those little things I used to take so much for granted. A soft bed, the change of seasons, ice cubes, paved roads, children's toys, a warm bath, apple pie, freely demonstrated affection—all these have taken on a new, wonderful meaning for me.

All in all, this Peace Corps experience is an enriching one. It will certainly do much to shape my life.

Test Ban Treaty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 27, 1963

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, it is an oversimplification to discuss and weigh the test-ban treaty solely on the basis of the relationships between the United States and Russia. As important as that relationship is to American interest, we are also an inseparable part of the larger community of nations and our total interest is deeply involved in the improvement of stability and progress in the many parts of the world which lay outside the scope of Russian-United States affairs.

In the introduction to the annual United Nations report Secretary General U Thant puts, I think, the considerations for affirmative action on the treaty appropriately in this larger context. Below is an extract from the report:

The test-ban treaty, although limited to three environments and marginal to the central problem of disarmament, is an important objective in itself. It will directly serve the humanitarian aim of ending the danger of ever-increasing radioactive fallout resulting from nuclear explosions. But it will also help restrict the spread of nuclear weapons and impose limitations on the development of new weapons of mass destruction, and thus be a factor in slowing down the arms race. This treaty could also point the way to the conclusion of a comprehensive treaty including a ban on underground tests.

Equally, if not more important are the political implications of the test-ban treaty. If this treaty is followed by agreement on other measures aimed at lessening international tension and establishing confidence among States, it may be the beginning of a new era of better understanding between nations and create a more favorable international climate that would facilitate progress toward general and complete disarmament and the goal of stable international peace and security, which remains the primary purpose of the United Nations. It would seem, therefore, all the more urgent that the partial test-ban treaty now concluded by the main parties be made universal by the accession of all states.

I believe that the opportunity so eagerly awaited by mankind will not be missed because of considerations of national interest, and that the enduring cause of world peace will prevail over short-range political considerations. I am strengthened in this belief by the improved relations between the

Soviet Union and the United States, which have come about in spite of the difficulties of these two great world powers in reconciling new developments and requirements in the fields of defense with their diverse interests and those of their respective allies.

Let's Keep Chicken War From Spreading

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 27, 1963

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, trade is a two-way proposition. The European Common Market's erection of high tariff chicken fences will keep our birds out of Europe. This action is an unnecessary injury from a group of nations that we have helped with billions of dollars of aid.

"What the Chicken War Means" is an editorial from the September issue of Farm Journal and is given below.

But rather than retaliation, the United States should take energetic action to insist upon the two-way lowering of agricultural tariffs in Europe and around the world. In economic, as in military, wars, both sides suffer:

WHAT THE CHICKEN WAR MEANS

These days the things that affect your income most may not happen on your farm at all. They may not happen in your neighborhood, in your county, or in your State. Or even in your country.

Suddenly we've got a chicken war looming between the United States and the six countries of the European Economic Community (Common Market). The EEC had pledged a stable tariff of 5 cents a pound on our poultry. Overnight they broke their promise, turn on us, hiked poultry duties to 13½ cents (up 170 percent), and cut American farmers out of \$48 million of sales.

Some city newspapers are laughing this off as some kind of comical chicken war of small proportions. It is nothing of the kind. The Common Market, all through its formative years, has assured us that tariffs on our other goods would be reasonable. But in the last year, when they got down to deciding the issue, they hiked tariffs on our fruit by 36 percent, on our wheat and flour by more than 100 percent, on our tobacco by nearly 50 percent. And all this may be but a forerunner of more to come.

We've given European farmers a very great deal of help, both with money and know-how. In return, they are clamoring for higher tariffs against more American farm products. "We can raise a lot more of our food here—why let the Americans do it?" they say. And given high enough support prices, protected by sufficiently high tariffs, they can do it.

They have some juicy targets to shoot at. The EEC countries now buy 52 percent of our dollar exports of feed grains, 31 percent of our wheat and flour exports; 31 percent of our tobacco exports, 20 percent of our fruit and vegetable shipments—a total of \$1.2 billion worth of our farmstuff a year. Moreover, they pay us in U.S. dollars.

When you consider that in this country one acre of cropland out of every five is devoted to raising something for export—and that our export crops are the ones in surplus trouble here—you can see the enormity of U.S. farmers' stake in what's going on. Not

only crops farmers but livestock men are affected.

For that matter the whole country has reason for tremendous concern. Partly due to an already unfavorable balance of trade we're losing gold to the rest of the world at a frightening rate. In view of this the Nation can't afford to let anything serious happen to its farm exports—not when they comprise one-fourth of all U.S. sales abroad.

The one encouraging thing that's happening is that our Government is at last beginning to talk in the only terms anybody over there seems to be able to understand—possible increase of some tariffs here. Some may call this retaliation. It might better be called self-defense—defense not only of our farmers but our gold supply.

Conversation, reasoning, pleading, cajoling have gotten us nowhere. We've sent two Secretaries of Agriculture over there—Benson and Freeman. The President wrote Mr. Adenauer of Germany a note. It's been largely a waste of time. Now, late in the day, we're starting to act. It would seem about time.

We may lose some of our markets over there anyway. European farmers are fast gaining some of the efficiencies we've achieved in this country. If they can outdo us in a fair race, power to them. But if they're going to do it by walling us out we'll have to consider our own walls. Trade can't be a one-way street.

It would be too bad to get into a tariff-raising contest with the EEC. Both sides would lose. But if one wants to play the game this way the other will be forced to. That ought to be made clear, right now and with no pussyfooting around.

The Establishment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 27, 1963

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the New York Journal American of August 22, 1963, published a very interesting article, by Mr. John Chamberlain, entitled "Yes, Folks, There's An Establishment." I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Journal American, Aug. 22, 1963]

YES, FOLKS, THERE'S AN ESTABLISHMENT

(By John Chamberlain)

Anyone who writes a column gets letters from people who are convinced that the Government of the United States—and the world, for that matter—is in the hands of conspirators. The litany is familiar: there is, supposedly, a group of one worlders, bent on subjugating the United States to a UN that will be subservient, in its turn, to the Communist nations.

The one worlders are pictured as dominating the centers of power in both major U.S. political parties. They don't care who wins an election if it is a Roosevelt versus a Wilkie, or an Eisenhower versus a Stevenson. But if an independent man like the late Robert Taft looms as a likely Presidential nominee, the forces of the "conspiracy" move into action at once to circumvent his success.

In its bald outlines, the "conspiracy theory" won't wash: things don't happen because there is a mysterious high command that pulls the strings to get a fore-ordained result. However, there is a more sophisticated theory that the American political system is dominated, not by a crude conspiracy, but by something called the establishment, a sort of high level, honorable Mafia that reacts in knee-jerk fashion to keep things as they are for the benefit of those who have held positions of power and influence for a long time.

The establishment, according to this theory, doesn't want to hand the world over to the UN or to the Communists—but it believes in accommodation with the Communists through the UN. It just doesn't want to push issues, whether they affect the domestic economy or international politics, to showdowns. And it maintains itself, not by conspiratorial subversion, but by appealing to the Milquetoast that is in every contented or semicontented family.

Well, what about this establishment? Is it a reality? When a "liberal" commentator, Richard Rovere, in a semiserious, semimocking article, identified the members of the establishment, he was careful to cover his flank by indicating that he might be spoofing.

William F. Buckley, the editor of the conservative fortnightly National Review, who can identify the members of the establishment for anyone who will send him a self-addressed postcard with a stamp, thinks Rovere was spoofing when he implied that he was spoofing.

The establishment, according to Buckley and/or Rovere, includes eastern bankers, the presidents of great universities, the editors of the Washington Post and the New York Times, most economists on the Harvard faculty, and three out of five big figures in Wall Street. Their influence supposedly moves, by the mysterious ways of money, into both of the big political organizations to make all important candidates "safe." And the "liberal" hierarchy among the writers is depleted as spreading incense as the establishment's charades are acted out.

Discounting Rovere, however, no establishment man has ever clearly admitted that there is any such thing as the establishment. Or, rather, nobody ever admitted it before this month of August in 1963. The first clean-cut 14-karat, Cadillac-powered admission by a presumed establishment journalist that there is such a thing as an establishment appears, rather coyly, in an article in the Saturday Evening Post. The man who makes the admission is Stewart Alsop, and he does it in a column of commentary that is appended to his article on BARRY GOLDWATER's presidential chances for 1964.

Stewart Alsop thinks GOLDWATER has a chance of getting the Republican nomination if the public opinion polls, come next June, show that Kennedy will be a clear winner in November, anyway. In other words, certain people in the Republican Party who have a veto power will not exercise it to head off GOLDWATER in a losing year. But if it ever should appear to be certain that GOLDWATER might actually beat Kennedy, the possessors of the Republican veto would not be so complacent.

Who possesses the power of veto in Republican ranks? Why, says Stewart Alsop, it is the establishment. What is this establishment? It is "the moderate-internationalist, old-money wing of the party." If it appears that GOLDWATER might take Kennedy, "the establishment will marshal all its power to block his nomination. In the past, that would have been enough. . . . But there is no visible candidate to fit the miracle-man role of Wilkie in 1940 and Eisenhower in 1952."

This isn't Robert Welch of the Birch Society speaking of mysterious "liberal" manipulation of all the centers of American